

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are currently pending in the present application, Claims 1, 3, and 5 having been amended by way of the present amendment. No new matter has been added.¹

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Sekine, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,370,330, hereinafter “Sekine”); and Claims 2, 4, and 6 were allowed.

As an initial matter, Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the allowance of Claims 2, 4, and 6.

Amended Claim 1 recites an image processor, including:

a motion calculator... configured to calculate a motion vector between the first image and the second image based on horizontal and vertical projective data that is acquired by computing, in a predetermined direction, pixel values in each of the predetermined motion detecting area;

a displacement calculator configured to calculate an image correlativity between a basic image area of the first image and each of a plurality of areas of the second image by calculating an absolute value for each difference between corresponding pixel values determined by the horizontal and vertical projective data, the sum of the absolute values in each of the horizontal and vertical directions being used as a correlativity value having a minimal value in each of the plurality of areas of the second image having the greatest correlativity between pixels, the areas of the second image being along the direction of the motion vector such that the most correlative area of each of the plurality of areas of the second image is selected, and configured to calculate an amount of pixel displacement based on the correlativity value; and

an image output unit configured to cut away an area from a camera-shake compensation area designated in the second image based on the amount of pixel displacement.

As described on page 9 of Applicants' specification, when the absolute values of the differences between the values of corresponding pixels are calculated as a way of calculating image correlativity, and the sum of the absolute values is acquired as a correlativity value, the

¹ Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 3, and 5 is found at least on pages 5-6 and 9 of the specification and in Figs. 3(a)-(d).

correlativity value takes its minimal value in the area that has the greatest correlativity.

Accordingly, by calculating correlativity values along the direction of the motion vector, and by selecting among the rectangular areas an area that provides the minimal value, the most correlative area can be selected. Thus, because the image output unit outputs, as an image for the image output area of the second frame, a rectangular area having the strongest correlativity with the image that has been subject to the calculation by the displacement calculator, and that is in the image output area of the first frame, the claimed invention has an advantage that an accurate camera-shake-compensated image for the image output area is obtained.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sekine does not disclose or suggest “a displacement calculator configured to calculate an image correlativity between a basic image area of the first image and each of a plurality of areas of the second image by calculating an absolute value for each difference between corresponding pixel values determined by the horizontal and vertical projective data, the sum of the absolute values in each of the horizontal and vertical directions being used as a correlativity value having a minimal value in each of the plurality of areas of the second image having the greatest correlativity between pixels, the areas of the second image being along the direction of the motion vector such that the most correlative area of each of the plurality of areas of the second image is selected, and configured to calculate an amount of pixel displacement based on the correlativity value,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Consequently, Sekine does not disclose or suggest all of the elements in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Sekine does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claims 3 and 5, while differing in scope and statutory class from Claim 1, patentably define over Sekine for substantially the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly,

it is respectfully submitted that Sekine does not anticipate or render obvious the features of independent Claims 3 and 5. Therefore, independent Claims 3 and 5 are believed to patentably define over Sekine.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

CARL E. SCHLIER
REGISTRATION NO. 34,426